ARRIAN'S *ANABASIS* AND BOOK XVII OF DIODORUS

By R. B. Steele

Fränkel in *Die Quellen der Alexanderhistoriker* (pp. 460 ff.) con-
cludes that Diodorus reproduces the work of Clitarchus with some
modifications, and that he, as well as Aristobulus, the chief source
of Arrian, made use of Callisthenes, Onesicritus, Chares, and Near-
chus. The selection by Arrian of Aristobulus and Ptolemy is of
itself an indication that their historical method differed from that
of Clitarchus. He criticizes or omits many of the highly colored
incidents found in Diodorus and has unnumbered details not re-
corded by the latter. That they are widely different in statements
of facts is admitted, and the object of this investigation is to
determine whether they have retained a similar form of statement.
The data will be presented under two heads: I, personal—historical,
ethical, rhetorical; and II, individual words and syntax.

I. PERSONAL

Arrian, *Anabasis* (vii. 22. 5),[1] in an original discussion names
Seleucus as the greatest of the followers of Alexander. In contrast
with this Diodorus (xvii. 103. 6) and Curtius (ix. 8. 22–24), by
implication, assign this position to Ptolemy. Diodorus refers to
other writers only a few times, but Arrian, in addition to his main
sources, frequently mentions others and also reports items from the
logos. He speaks of heroes only incidentally (iv. 8. 3; iv. 11. 3),
while Diodorus in his opening paragraph, section 4, declares that
Alexander was equal to any of the ancients, and by an adjective or
adverb presents the heroic deeds of Admetus (45. 6), of Erigyius
(83. 6), and of Porus (88. 6; see 95. 2; 102. 4).

The ethical environment set forth by the two writers is not the
same. Diodorus (118. 1) mentions εὐσεβές as a spring of action;
τὸ θεῖον (116. 1) and τὸ δαιμόνιον (116. 5). Arrian freely uses the
last two expressions and has τυχόν a dozen times (see Boehner, *De
Arriani dicendi genere*,[2] p. 39), with a few incidental references to

[1] In succeeding references, with Arrian *sc. Anabasis*, and with Diodorus xvii.

[2] *Acta Seminarii Phil. Erlangensis*, IV, 1 ff.

τύχη, whose importance in the eyes of Diodorus is shown by more than a score of occurrences. Various forms of τυγχάνω are found, the compound in ἐν- most freely in Arrian. In contrast with this are such expressions as συνέβη γενέσθαι (Diodorus 63. 4; 66. 2; 100. 1, and 103. 7). Compare Arrian i. 1. 9; i. 27. 7; ii. 10. 3; iv. 2. 5; v. 23. 5, usually συνέβη ὅπως εἴκασε. Necessity is stated alike in both, though Diodorus has ἀναγκαῖον applied to objective facts (43. 9; 55. 1; 94. 1) as well as to his own impelling motive (1. 4; 5. 3; 117. 5).

Some expressions of mental conditions and activities are peculiar to Arrian. Nominal and verbal forms of νοῦς are freely used,[1] and the impulse of Alexander is given with several verbs (i. 3. 5; ii. 3. 1; iii. 1. 5; vii. 2. 2; vii. 16. 2). Diodorus is strongly inclined to magnify, as is shown by ὑπερβολή in more than a dozen passages (see 11. 5; 20. 5; 101. 1; 103. 7). Arrian has the plural (iv. 11. 4), the noun, of physical passage (iii. 30. 6), and the verb in similar connections, while in Diodorus it is freely used in metaphorical statements. A number of other formations in ὑπερ- are not in Arrian, though we find ὑπερφέρω (not in Diodorus) (v. 4. 2; vi. 22. 7; vii. 6. 3). The use of γέμω is similar (Diodorus 94. 4; 104. 6); with physical objects (70. 2; 71. 1; 81. 1); and γεμίσαντας (105. 7).

Diodorus abounds in characterizations, and ἀνδρεία and ἀνδραγαθία occur scores of times, while there are corresponding verbal forms (89. 3; 99. 2; 100. 2; Arrian vii. 5. 4). The adjective and verbal forms used in such connections differ widely. Diodorus has διαφέρων (29) most freely, and διάφορος (20. 2; 32. 1; 75. 7). Besides these he uses a number of other prepositional compounds, as προέχων, also in Arrian (v. 17. 4). Words expressing admiration, as well as μεγαλοπρεπῶς and παραδόξως, with their corresponding adjective forms, are characteristic of Diodorus. He prefers the verb, generally the participle σπεύδων, to express the intense activity of Alexander, though occasionally he has κατὰ σπουδήν, which is in Arrian once (iii. 29. 6), but σπουδῇ scores of times. Diodorus also emphasizes ἐνέργεια, and in contrast with this has ἡσυχία in about a dozen places; in Arrian only (i. 14. 5; ii. 8. 5). The forms of incidental references

[1] ii. 26. 4; vii. 1. 5; vii. 18. 4; Praef. 3; iii. 18. 12; vi. 10. 3; ii. 4. 5; v. 23. 6; vii. 17. 2, et al.

differ. We find οὐκ ἀνοίκειον (Diodorus 71. 3), but ἄξιον more frequently, and with a negative (27.7; 46. 6); and with μνήμης (38. 5; 99. 1; 100. 1). The latter is in Arrian (ii. 24. 6), but also λόγου (v. 7. 3; vi. 9. 5; vii. 7. 7).

Some rhetorical differences are noticeable. There are a few examples of chiasmus in Arrian (e.g., i. 12. 9; ii. 7. 9), but, in contrast with this, the etymological figure occurs frequently (vii. 17. 1; vii. 23. 8); θυσίας . . . . θύεσθαι (vii. 14. 1; vii. 17. 4). Boehner (p. 34) calls attention to the frequent repetition of the noun by Arrian, thus avoiding the use of a pronoun. However, this usage with the verb is just as noticeable, 'Αρρύβας γὰρ νόσῳ ἀπέθανεν. ἀπέθανεν δὲ καὶ 'Αντίοχος (see i. 16. 6; i. 25. 8; ii. 4. 8; ii. 11. 5, 9; ii. 25. 2; ii. 27. 6; iii. 5. 4; iii. 5. 5).

II. INDIVIDUAL WORDS AND SYNTAX

A. INDIVIDUAL WORDS

1. *Time.*—The ways of fixing the center of reference for the actions of Alexander and his associates are very different. The fourscore occurrences of ἐν τούτῳ in Arrian are not relatively as frequent as those of μετὰ ταῦτα in Diodorus. One gives the actors in the midst of their activities; the other is retrospective. The plan of Arrian required a very free use of τότε, for which he often substitutes ἐν τῷ τότε and εἰς τότε (vi. 28. 4). He has more than forty instances of πάλαι, while both use τὸ παλαιόν, as also ἔτι and ἤδη, though there are comparatively few occurrences of the last two in Diodorus. Παραυτίκα seems limited to Arrian, as also αὖ, and αὖθις of which eighty occurrences were noticed. 'Εφεξῆς occurs (iv. 12. 2, 3; iv. 18. 7; vi. 11. 2) and ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐφεξῆς (vii. 11. 8), while ἑξῆς is preferred by Diodorus, and except for one instance (Arrian v. 17. 4) he only has πάλιν, Arrian usually having ἔμπαλιν alone, but with ἐς (iii. 12. 1) and with εἰς (ii. 11. 6). The general usage with ἅμα is not the same, though both use it singly and repeated as an adverb. With participles it is limited in Diodorus to seven examples of πραττομένοις. But the chief difference is in the prepositional usage in Diodorus, ἅμα δὲ τούτῳ (33. 6); ἅμα τούτοις (1. 2). Arrian associates it not only with these pronouns but with others of which οἷ is the most noticeable. It occurs also with

common nouns and still more freely with proper names. Diodorus has ὁμοῦ with contrasted terms (13. 3), and Arrian has φιλίοις τε ὁμοῦ καὶ πολεμίοις (iii. 11. 3; v. 17. 6) and it is repeated (iii. 22. 2; iv. 4. 7). Peculiar to Arrian is its association with ἤδη in nine passages, and in the same number it does not differ from ἅμα in emphasizing the temporal phases of accompaniment (e.g., i. 8. 3; ii. 3. 5; ii. 27. 6).

Arrian, giving the record by men who marched with Alexander, freely refers to the morrow, using ὑστεραίᾳ twenty-nine times, and with ἐς ten. We find νυκτός and νύκτωρ in both works. Compare with these ἐν νυκτί (v. 24. 1 [twice]; vi. 21. 4; vi. 26. 4), and ἅμα ἐν νυκτί (iii. 10. 2).

The far greater number of passages in Arrian fixing the time indicates that the ultimate source must have been a direct observer of the events recorded.

2. *Place.*—Some phases of local expression are as marked as are the temporal. Arrian usually has αὐτοῦ instead of αὐτόθι but uses the latter (iii. 2. 4; v. 5. 1; Diodorus 69. 6). The examples of οὗ are limited to ten in Arrian, with scores of occurrences of εἴσω and ἔξω, ἵνα and ἵναπερ, πόρρω and πρόσω. He alone has ἐνθένδε and ἐνθένπερ and ὅπου ten times. He is freest in the use of ἔνθα and ἔνθεν, ἐνταῦθα and ἐντεῦθεν, and has ἐκεῖ sixteen times (Diodorus 117. 1, κἀκεῖ), and ἐκεῖσε (i. 29. 3; iv. 11. 8; v. 3. 2; Diodorus 33. 6, κἀκεῖσε).

The particles in -θεν are one of the noticeable features in Arrian. A few are used as freely by Diodorus, e.g., πανταχόθεν seven times, and Arrian eight. In contrast with this, the latter has πάντοθεν fifteen times, and ἐκεῖθεν sixteen (Diodorus 108. 8). Still more noticeable are fifty-four occurrences of πρόσθεν, ἐπίπροσθεν (iii. 9. 2), and ἔμπροσθεν, five times (Diodorus 18. 2, τοὔμπροσθεν). Because of its form we also give δῆθεν (iv. 18. 4; vi. 13. 2; vii. 8. 2; vii. 14. 5; vii. 23. 2).

3. *Manner.*—Χαλεπῶς and ῥᾳδίως may be taken to indicate in fair degree the difference in verbal coloring. Diodorus uses both without a negative, while Arrian favors the former with a negative, and for him things are not easily done, but not with difficulty. He has ῥᾳδίως only a few times but εὐμαρῶς and εὐπετῶς often. Here also may be mentioned his freedom with ᾗ and ᾗπερ, as also with

ὅπῃ (15) and πολλαχῇ (11), while πάντῃ and ταύτῃ are among the words he uses most freely. Diodorus has καθόλου nine times, and λαμπρός, ὅμοιος, παντελής, πολυτελής, and ταχύ more freely than Arrian.

4. *Nouns.*—We shall present only nouns in -βολή, -δρομή, and -χώριοι. Ἐκβολή is found a score of times in Arrian (Diodorus 75. 2; 104. 3). The relative frequency for ἐμβολή, προσβολή, and συμβολή is about the same, but προβολή seems limited to Arrian. On the other hand Diodorus has only six other compounds, not counting ὑπερβολή, occurring twenty-four times. Peculiar to him also is περίβολος (50. 3; 52. 3; 71. 5; 85. 3). Ἐκδρομή occurs most freely of the nouns in -δρομή, fourteen times in Arrian. Other forms are ἐπιδρομή (Arrian i. 20. 5; vii. 21. 2), καταδρομή (iv. 1. 3; iv. 16. 6), συνδρομή (vi. 3. 4; Diodorus 19. 1; 63. 1; 101. 4). Arrian has ἐγχώριοι and ἐπιχώριοι, but προσχώριοι more often than these two combined. Diodorus uses πλησιοχώριοι freely as a noun and as an adjective (64. 2; 87. 1; 113. 2).

5. *Pronouns.*—Such combinations as ἄλλον ἐξ ἄλλου occur by the score in the *Anabasis*, but in Diodorus they are limited to 37. 1, though he favors ἀλλήλων and ἀμφότερος. With οἶ, σφῶν, and σφέτερος the usage of the two is entirely distinct. Arrian has οἶ in more than a score of passages, the larger part similar to ἅμα οἶ ἄγων (i. 15. 3). The plural forms are noticeable (see Boehner, p. 31). These are sometimes reinforced as σφῶν τε αὐτῶν (iv. 13. 7); σφᾶς αὐτούς (iv. 17. 6; Diodorus 22. 4). All the examples of ὅτι περ and the nine of σφέτερος are in Arrian, who also uses ὅπερ much oftener than Diodorus. Notice Arrian ὅσωνπερ (iv. 21. 9) and similar forms (vi. 14. 4; vi. 29. 10; vii. 1. 6). Here also may be mentioned his thirteen examples of ἐς τοσόνδε. He has τοὺς μέν . . . . τοὺς δέ a few times, for which in corresponding passages Diodorus uses οὓς μέν . . . . οὓς δέ.

6. *Adjectives.*—The different forms of πᾶς are not evenly distributed between the two works, the most marked contrast being in the use of σύμπας, which is found at least seventy-nine times in Arrian; in Diodorus once (17. 4). However, the latter favors ἅπας, 48 to 15, and has πᾶς relatively more freely, 148 to 190. Another favorite of his is ἴδιος, fifty-two times, seven neuter and most of

them with συνέβη. The plural is found eight times; also κατ' ἰδίαν (112. 3). Arrian uses the latter without a preposition (i. 26. 4); ἰδίᾳ, eight times, and ἐς τὰ ἴδια (v. 25. 1). In contrast with Diodorus he has ἐπέκεινα a score of times, while κάρτερος, κουφότατος, and ὅσος are favorites, the latter being especially noticeable with numerals. Diodorus is inclined to the use of ὅλος, πλησίος, and πολλαπλάσιος, and has most of the instances of παντοδαπός, παραθαλάττιος, and περιβόητος. Παμπληθεῖς is in 35. 2; 61. 3; 110. 6; πλήρης in 26. 6; 32. 1; 110. 5; and πληρόω occurs more freely than in Arrian.

7. *Numerals.*—Both writers have prepositions with numerals, and ἐς in such connections is one of the marked features of the style of Arrian, εἰς taking its place in a few passages. Περί occurs less freely, and ὑπέρ in a dozen passages (Diodorus 14. 1; 21. 6; 89. 2; 102. 6). The most noticeable use of μάλιστα in Arrian is with numerals, but this association was not noticed in Diodorus. However, he has about a dozen examples of σχεδόν, generally with ἅπας, but with numerals (69. 3; 110. 3; cf. 94. 1, σχεδὸν ὀκταετῆ χρόνον; and Arrian iii. 15. 6, σχεδόν τι οἱ ἡμίσεες). Forms of λείπων indicate less than the given number in Diodorus 65. 1 and 109. 2, and in eight other passages show a falling short in some quality. The same use is made of ἐλάττων in half a dozen places with numerals, and in another connection (38. 1). Arrian uses the word with a negative (ii. 5. 7; v. 20. 4). For πλείους see Arrian i. 3. 5; i. 11. 3; iii. 30. 11; πλείονας, iv. 6. 2; vii. 13. 1—all with a negative; in contrast with ἐλάττους see Diodorus 9. 3; 21. 6; 31. 2; 36. 6. Arrian also has οὐ πλείων ἤ (ii. 11. 10; iii. 7. 7), and ἀποδέων with numerals (i. 14. 4; v. 4. 4; v. 24. 5), and with οὐ πολύ (v. 14. 1; vi. 2. 4).

8. *Particles.*—One of the clearly marked contrasts is in the usage with τε καί. The average is only about one occurrence for every two pages in Diodorus, either together or separated. In Arrian the two are everywhere in evidence, and two examples in one short statement are not unusual (i. 9. 10; i. 21. 1; vii. 15. 4). There may be three (vi. 27. 4; vii. 1. 2), four (i. 24. 1, 2), or even five (i. 22. 2; see also v. 12. 2; vi. 2. 3; vii. 12. 3). Noticeable in Diodorus are διό (29), διόπερ (25), and διότι (8); in Arrian iv. 9. 7. The former begins many a statement with τὸ πρῶτον, generally inclosing

μὲν or μὲν οὖν, while Arrian prefers the plural (e.g., i. 20. 8; ii. 10. 1; iii. 6. 5). But in indicating the limit Diodorus uses τέλος more freely and has the variation τὸ τελευταῖον (111. 3; 115. 6). The *Anabasis* has ὡσαύτως a score of times and οὕτως or οὕτω frequently, and these are not uncommonly associated with δή, which occurs nearly four hundred times and about one in five with μέν. Arrian favors οὔκουν and has μὲν οὖν a few times. This combination is used oftener than οὖν by Diodorus, and the sum for him far outnumbers the sum for Arrian. Boehner (p. 30) gives the occurrences of καίτοι with participles, though it generally appears in other connections. This word seems limited to Arrian, and also μέντοι (10), excepting Diodorus (8. 6). Ἄρα is found in more than a score of passages, and ἅτε in ten, usually with a participle, and in ii. 18. 5 and vii. 7. 7 with δή (see Boehner, pp. 51–52, and for οἷα as an equivalent see p. 51). In contrast with this we find ἅτε in Diodorus 88. 4 only; but ὥσπερ (38. 6; 117. 2), ὡσπερεὶ τετρωμένος (112. 5). There is a freer usage in Arrian, and thirty-six instances of καθάπερ to two in Diodorus (54. 2; 112. 6). Notice also μᾶλλόν τι and μεῖον, e.g., ἀλλ᾽ Ἀλέξανδρος ἤλαυνεν οὐδὲν μεῖον (iii. 28. 9). But see in the same sentence ᾔει δὲ ὅμως. In Arrian ὡς is found in several connections. There are scores of examples of ὡς ἐπί, and occasionally with some other preposition, as ὡς ἐς μάχην; ὡς εἰς πόλεμον (Diodorus 86. 5). It is freely used in parenthetic statements, but ὡς ἔχειν is characteristic of Arrian: i. 13. 6; ii. 11. 4; iv. 2. 6; v. 13. 1; v. 23. 3; and vi. 6. 6, ὡς τάχους ποδῶν εἶχον. There is the least difference with participles, but Diodorus has more examples with ἄν (e.g., 33. 4; 33. 7; 77. 6; and 96. 2). This is unusual for Arrian, Ἀλέξανδρος ὡς καὶ ταῦτα ἂν πράξας καὶ εἰπών (ii. 12. 8).

9. *Prepositions.*—In no respect are the personal preferences of the writers more clearly expressed than with prepositions, both improper and proper. Arrian has ὡς as a preposition, ἧκεν ὡς Ἀλέξανδρον (i. 4. 6; i. 25. 9; iv. 22. 6; v. 20. 7). Diodorus on the other hand uses χωρίς a dozen times. There is some difference in the usage with nearly all the others. This is least marked perhaps with πρό and παρά. Arrian has the former in one noticeable phrase, πρὸ πολλοῦ πεφεύγεσαν (vi. 6. 6); and Diodorus emphasizes the dative, especially ἀμφοτέροις, with παρά. Arrian only uses ἀμφί, and

80 per cent of all the occurrences in personal connections, the larger part of the remainder in temporal expressions or with numerals. Place is indicated, ἀμφὶ τὸ ἱερόν (i. 23. 5; iii. 16. 5; vii. 20. 3). He has σύν at least 208 times (Diodorus seven), oftenest with στρατιᾷ and δυνάμει. The latter word occurs most freely thirty times, in Diodorus with μετά (Arrian i. 5. 8). This is his favorite preposition and is most noticeable with ταῦτα, μάχην, and with ὀλίγον (31. 4; 101. 4; 103. 2; 5; 116. 4).

a) Frequency: Arrian has ἕνεκα, εἵνεκα (perhaps οὕνεκα, i. 12. 10; iv. 15. 2) in about two score of passages (see Boehner, p. 44); in Diodorus 24. 1; 77. 2; 110. 5; and 15. 2, ἕνεκα τοῦ μηδὲν ἀνήκεστον παθεῖν. Πλήν as a preposition and πλήν γε δή are found chiefly in the *Anabasis*. Diodorus uses εἰς, though ἐς is prevalent in the *Anabasis*. According to Herscher (*Minora Scripta*, ad p. vi. [*Indica* 3. 8]), "Undevicies in hoc libello diphthongus legitur, vocalis simplex ducentis viginti amplius." The most noticeable feature is its use with numerals, and after this with adjectives and adverbs, especially those of time. The use of διά with μακροῦ and ὀλίγου is similar, though the preposition is used relatively five times as freely by Diodorus. He also stresses ὑπό with the genitive and the accusative, the dative occurring 66. 7, ὑπὸ τῷ θρόνῳ. The most pronounced feature in Arrian is ὑπὸ τὴν ἔω at least thirteen times. Time is stated, ὑπὸ τῇ πρώτῃ ἐμβολῇ (ii. 22. 2); and there are at least nineteen other instances of the dative.

b) Associations: Both works have ἄνευ and μέχρι, for the most part, in entirely different associations. The *Anabasis* has ἀνά in a few places with local connections, and ἀνὰ κράτος (iv. 17. 1), while Diodorus has ἀνὰ μέσον seven times. Arrian shows the greater freedom with ἀντί (34 to 4) because it is used to give the details of changes in petty rulers, matters which are not usually mentioned by Diodorus, who has ἀπό to designate temporal relations (71. 1), ἀπὸ Κύρου, other examples taking the form ἀπὸ τούτων γενόμενος (73. 1; 81. 1; 95. 3; 106. 2). Time is expressed by ἐκ with a few nouns (Arrian vii. 14. 4, ἐκ παιδός); but generally with a pronoun, and πολλοῦ, a dozen times (Diodorus 99. 5), and ἐκ παλαιοῦ, seven. With other adjectives and adverbs the usage is fairly free (see Boehner, p. 41). The larger part of the examples of ἐν are with τούτῳ (81),

τῷ τότε (48), νυκτί (11), and ἡμέραις (14). The first three are con-
fined to the *Anabasis*, while the last is as freely used by Diodorus.
The latter inclines to ἐν μάχῃ (the plural in Arrian ii. 7. 7), the former
to ἐν χερσί (Diodorus 56. 1). There are also occurrences with
adverbs, and in this respect ἐν resembles ἐκ, but the associations are
for the most part different.

In temporal expressions, Diodorus favors κατά, e.g., 101. 3, κατὰ
τὸν ἐξῆς πότον; and, excepting in a few passages with numerals
and 38. 2, ὑπὲρ τὴν ἡλικίαν, has ὑπέρ only with the genitive—about
twenty examples. In the *Anabasis* are the same number with
numerals, and a small number with local associations. For ὑπέρ =
de, see Boehner (p. 46). The use of ἐπί with the accusative is about
the same; but Arrian has it more freely with the genitive and
much more so with the dative. Of most interest are ὡς ἐπί, ἐπὶ μέγα,
and ἐπὶ πολύ. In Diodorus are more than a dozen examples with
ἡμέρας, and with this compare Arrian iv. 13. 5. Other temporal
phrases are few, e.g., ἔστε ἐπὶ βουλυτόν (ii. 3. 3). Among the nouns
in the dative we find ἡμέρᾳ (Arrian ii. 26. 4; iii. 4. 2; iii. 21. 6) and
τελευτῇ (i. 10. 5); while Diodorus has τούτοις (8. 2; 28. 2; 84. 1).
The free use of ἀμφί in the *Anabasis* left little room for περί in per-
sonal connections, though with the accusative it gives both time
and place, and also occurs with numerals. Most of the examples
with the genitive in Diodorus express personal relations; in the
Anabasis the nouns are mostly abstract, so that the proportion of
the two classes differs widely. The dative seems limited to Arrian
i. 22. 6; i. 27. 1; vi. 18. 2; vii. 24. 2, περὶ τῷ θρόνῳ. The relative
frequency for πρός with all the cases is about the same, but there is
not an even distribution. Diodorus avoids it with the genitive,
but has it with the accusative more than twice as often as Arrian,
and with the dative, usually τούτοις, only half as frequently. A few
passages (as Diodorus 40. 1 and 113. 1) give temporal relations, and
local (25. 5). This usage is quite marked in the *Anabasis*: iii. 8. 7
and iv. 20. 1, πρὸς 'Ισσῷ, for the usual ἐν 'Ισσῷ. Noticeable are nine
examples of πρὸς ἕω (e.g., v. 3. 3; v. 5. 4; cf. 5. 6. 3).

If we take into the count both prepositions and compound
verbs there is no difference between Arrian and Diodorus, as the
former has 29. 33 per page (Roos's ed.) and the latter 29. 31 (Fisher's

ed.).   But the two elements are not equally distributed, the numbers for Arrian being 15. 24 and 14. 09, and for Diodorus 12. 69 and 16. 62.   One emphasizes the preposition, the other the compound verb. Prepositions with the infinitive occur most freely in Diodorus, and διά most often; in Arrian εἰς and ἐπί.

Diodorus seems the more inclined to the use of inlocked prepositional phrases.   This usage is not limited to a few prepositions for most of them occur in phrases expressing an attributive relation to some other phrase.   A single instance from each will be enough for illustration: ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Ἰσσῷ μάχης (Diodorus 39. 1); ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπὶ θάτερα τῆς πόλεως ναυτικοῦ (Arrian ii. 21. 8).

A common rhetorical feature is the same preposition in successive phrases, e.g., διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν διὰ τούτων (Diodorus 53. 1).   See also with ἐπί (18. 4; 82. 1); with κατά (103. 7).   The *Anabasis* has παρά and πρός most freely (i. 19. 1; i. 25. 4, 9; ii. 2. 1; iii. 23. 8; iv. 1. 1; iv. 5. 1; v. 20. 6; i. 25. 4; ii. 17. 2; v. 26. 3).

Arrian and Diodorus vary greatly in their use of participles, the average for one being 15. 8 per page; for the other, 10. 7.   Examples of ἄρας are noticeable in the *Anabasis*, and of χρώμενος in Diodorus, who has the genitive absolute about four and one-half times as often as Arrian.   The usage with individual verbs also shows some clearly marked tendencies.   One feature peculiar to Diodorus is ὑπῆρχε instead of ἦν (e.g., 7. 2; 34. 5; 71. 7; 90. 1).   He is also more inclined to use εἶναι and its compounds with the infinitive (13. 6; 60. 4; 82. 8; 25. 4; 34. 1; 38. 6; Arrian v. 18. 5; vi. 27. 5).

There are clear indications of selection in the case of a few verbs. Βούλομαι, usually a participle, is the regular word for Diodorus, but ἐθέλω for Arrian, though he has some instances of the former (ii. 14. 4; v. 2. 3; v. 27. 1; v. 27. 7 [twice]; vi. 14. 3; vii. 10. 5), all in the presumed remarks of the actors.   For the *Anabasis* καλούμενος is regular (συνεπι-, vi. 3. 1).   Diodorus has ἐπι- in 20. 7, and ἐγ- in 113. 1, though he prefers ὀνομαζόμενος.   Both have finite forms of the two verbs (see Boehner, *Arriana*).[1]

There are clearly marked distinctions in the use of verbs of motion.   T. Hultzsch[2] calls attention to the fact that forms of

---

[1] *Acta Seminarii Phil. Erlangensis*, II. 501 ff.

[2] *De Elocutione Diodori Siculi.   De Usu Aoristi et Imperfecti*, Pars I (1893), p. 22.

ἰέναι are rarely found in Diodorus. Arrian freely uses the aorist of the compounds in ἀπο- and ἐπι-, and the imperfect of ἀνα-, ἐπι-, and μετα-. There are scores of instances of ἐλαύνω and of its compounds, but the occurrences of these and of ἀφίκετο are few in Diodorus. The compounds of χωρέω are not equally stressed. That in προ- is frequent in Arrian, while προς- occurs less frequently; in Diodorus συν- is most freely used. He has προσάγω oftener than προ-, while Arrian prefers ἐπι-, though he has προς- occasionally. A few verbs seem limited to Diodorus, as ἤγγισε and συνήγγισε (41. 4; 49. 6), διανύω and κατανύω (49. 6). He has most of the occurrences of ἀθροίζω and of ἀναζευγνύω; see in 31. 2, ἀναζεύξας. Hultzsch (p. 84) states that forms of this verb in -μι do not occur in Diodorus (see Arrian i. 5. 1; and cf. i. 26. 5; ii. 5. 8; iii. 4. 5). There are similar differences in the use of βάλλω, δέχομαι, δίδωμι, λαμβάνω, πέμπω, στέλλω, as well as of a number of others occurring less frequently. A detailed statement will be given for verbs of dying. The regular one for Diodorus is τελευτάω; for Arrian, ἀποθνήσκω. Notice the occurrences in corresponding passages in Diodorus (21. 6; 36. 6) and Arrian (1. 16. 6; ii. 11. 8). Though the same words are used the forms may differ, as in statements of burial τετελευτηκότας (Diodorus 89. 3); τελευτήσαντας (Arrian v. 24. 6; Diodorus 14. 1; and 40, 1); but compare ἀποθανόντας (i. 23. 6). The same difference can be seen for ἔπεσον and ἀπέθανον in Diodorus (34. 5; 89. 1, 3) and in Arrian (i. 16. 4; v. 18. 2, 3). There is also a preference shown in the use of two other kindred verbs, for ἑάλω is as noticeable in Arrian as is ἀνεῖλε in Diodorus.

<div align="center">B. SYNTAX</div>

1. *Accusative of extent.*—Diodorus has σταδίους (33. 1; 87. 3) and ὁδόν (32. 2; 83. 2). Arrian has the same usage a few times, but with two distinct features, the indication of the extent by a prepositional phrase, e.g., ἐς πέντε μάλιστα σταδίους (i. 20. 2), ὅσον ἐς τριάκοντα σ. (iii. 9. 3), and also without the preposition ὅσον ἑξακοσίους σ. (iii. 8. 7).

2. *Conditional statements.*—Both use these freely, but only Arrian uses such parenthetic statements as σέ, εἴπερ τινὰ ἄλλον (iv. 11. 6), while Diodorus only has ἐάν (2. 5; 39. 1; 69. 1; 72. 2; 103. 1; 112. 3).

3. *Causal statements.*—The cause is freely given in the *Anabasis* by a ὅτι- clause, e.g., διὰ βαθύτητά τε καὶ ὅτι ὀξὺς ὁ ῥοῦς ἦν (iv. 25. 7). The restrictive ὅτι μή occurs in more than a score of passages (i. 19. 8; i. 26. 1; ii. 7. 8).

4. *Consecutive and final clauses.*—The statistics[1] for ὡς, ἵνα, and ὅπως in Arrian, the ὡς- sentences including tendency as well as purpose, show that ὡς with the infinitive, much less freely with finite forms of the verb, is the predominant particle, and that, numerically considered, ἵνα and ὅπως are not important. Ἵνα is commonly used to express local relations, but as a final particle it occurs in only four passages (see Diodorus 4. 8; 77. 7). Arrian has ὅπως most freely with the indicative, as ὅπως εἶχον (i. 27. 7), and in the phrase συνέβη ὅπως εἴκασε. It occurs with ἄν (iv. 22. 6; vii. 15. 2). The ten final clauses are all affirmative, excepting in vi. 4. 3. Both affirmative and negative clauses occur oftener in Diodorus, the most noticeable example being ὅπως μὴ δύνωνται κυκλοῦν (57. 5), which corresponds to similar statements in Arrian with ὡς (i. 4. 4; ii. 8. 4). The negative is used alone in ii. 3. 7; vi. 13. 1; vii. 13. 3. Arrian usually has ὥστε with finite forms of the verb (see Boehner, p. 56), while it was noticed in Diodorus seven times with the infinitive, and with a negative 8. 4.

5. *Temporal statements.*—At the head of the list of temporal particles in the *Anabasis* is ὡς with scores and scores of examples, occasionally with a correlative. Only twenty-seven were noticed in Diodorus, e. g., ὡς δ' ἤγγισαν (11. 3). Ἐπάν is limited to Arrian (iii. 3. 4; vi. 5. 7), and though he has more examples of ἐπεί with causal force, Diodorus has the particle oftener. He uses ἐπειδή occasionally (Arrian 27), and ἐπειδάν (106. 3), which occurs fifteen times in the *Anabasis*. Neither uses ὅτε or ὅταν freely, Arrian having τοτε . . . . ὅτε (ii. 1. 4; iv. 15. 1). Compare with these ὁπότε . . . . τότε (vii. 18. 6). He also has twenty-five other examples of ὁπότε. There is a free use of ἔστε, twenty-three instances with finite forms of the verb, and of these iii. 20. 4 gives local relations. With the infinitive it occurs five times, as in iv. 7. 1. The meaning is "as long as" or "until," and with the latter meaning nine passages have ἄν, and two (ii. 23. 3; iv. 30. 3) do not.

[1] Dr. H. A. Short, *AJP*, VII, 167, n. 1.

There are fifty-two examples of ἔστε ἐπί with either temporal or local force (see Boehner, *Arriana*, p. 504). Neither τέως nor ἔως is freely used (the latter in ii. 8. 2; iv. 27. 2); without a verb, ἔως ἑκατὸν καὶ εἴκοσι τὸ βάθος (i. 6. 1). Diodorus has it in 62. 1 and 92. 3; and with ἄν in 7. 7; 26. 1; and 28. 2. Arrian has πρίν as a preposition, πρὶν φάους (iii. 18. 6), in thirty passages with an infinitive, and a few times with finite forms of the verb, πρὶν Δαρεῖόν τε πεφευγότα ᾔσθοντο καὶ πρὶν ἀπορραγῆναι (ii. 11. 2; ii. 11. 7; vi. 13. 2; vii. 14. 3; vii. 22. 1); and with the subjunctive μή . . . . . πρίν . . . . κατίδωσιν (v. 16. 3).

The elements of expression in the works are widely different, and when these are wrought into connected narrative the results are not akin. There is a unity in the style of Arrian, and also, though a different one, in that of Diodorus, and the main features that we have considered are the same in the remaining parts of the works of both. Occasionally there is a similarity or equivalence of diction in the statement of some important point, while the context is entirely different. Arrian, Ταῦτα δὲ διαπραξάμενος ἐπανῆλθεν εἰς Μακεδονίαν (i. 11. 1) equals Diodorus, Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ὁ μὲν βασιλεὺς ἐπανελθών . . . . εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν . . . . (16. 1), but the latter goes on to tell of a council of the leaders and of contests, at Dios to Zeus and the Muses, which Archelaus had established. Arrian says that they were at Aegae, and brings in the reference to the Muses under λέγουσι. διαβαίνει τὸν πόρον (Arrian iii. 7. 5) is equivalent to τὸν πόρον . . . . μαθὼν διεβίβασε τὴν δύναμιν (Diodorus 55. 3), although the details in the entire chapter are not in harmony with those given by Arrian of the movements of Alexander from the Euphrates to the crossing of the Tigris.

Interpretations of the main fact may widely differ. Arrian (i. 20. 1) says that Alexander had in mind to dismiss the fleet because of lack of money, and because the Persian fleet was not strong. Diodorus says that the design was to cut off hope of retreat, as Alexander had done at the Granicus, and as Agathocles did. Memnon advised, according to Arrian i. 12. 9, not to run any risk (μὴ διὰ κινδύνου ἰέναι) but to harry the land. The opposition expressed by Arsites prevailed, because the Persians were suspicious of him. Diodorus (18. 2) has the equivalent (μὴ διακινδυνεύειν), but Memnon further

advises to carry the war into Europe, and these suggestions were rejected because unworthy of the magnanimity of the Persians.

As we have stated ἤδη is freely used by Arrian, and occurs in i. 20. 3, indicating the previous appointment of Memnon, and this fact is stated again (ii. 1. 1). Diodorus (23. 6; 29. 1) speaks of it as an act contemporaneous with the other events mentioned. Similar to this is Arrian (iii. 18. 10), where it is stated that Alexander found the Araxes already bridged, while Diodorus has Τὸν 'Αράξην ποτα-μὸν ζεύξας διεβίβασε τοὺς στρατιώτας (69. 2).

The data presented show two types of literary expression distinct in many particulars. If derived from a common source, for successive stages of the history, they have been so transformed that the products are no longer similar. At the same time, there are some points of resemblance, the result of the statement of events common to every history of Alexander. These need no unity of source for their explanation while the diversity of expression is against rather than for such a theory.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY